

THE WEEKLY AMERICAN BANNER.

BY MRS. HARRIET N. PREWETT.

YAZOO CITY, MISS. FRIDY, JULY 27, 1855

VOL. 1-NO. 10.

TERMS

Three dollars if paid in advance.
Four dollars if not paid within 6 months.
Five if delayed until the end of the year.
Advertisements are inserted at one dollar per square consisting of ten lines or less, and fifty cents for each subsequent insertion.
Liberal deductions made to those who advertise by the year.

AMERICAN BANNER.

R. B. MAYES, POLITICAL EDITOR.

FRIDAY, JULY 27.

Correction.—In our last issue Mr. Henderson is represented as referring to the Resolutions of '39 and '39 in proof that the American party had its birth in Virginia. His reference, however, was to a resolution passed by the same legislature which adopted those resolutions. The one which he quoted was passed January 16, 1799; a resolution to "oppose every constitutional barrier to the introduction of foreign influence in our National Councils," and expressing the opinion that the Constitution ought to be so amended that "NO FOREIGNER SHALL BE ELEGIBLE TO THE OFFICE OF SENATOR OR REPRESENTATIVE IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, NOR TO ANY OFFICE IN THE JUDICIARY OR EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT." [See Henning's Statutes, vol 2, page 194, new series.]

Brownson vs. the Antis.

We deny that the American party propose any persecution, unless it be persecution in the Whigs to vote against Democrats, and the Democrats against Whigs.

This would be a gross misapprehension of the word persecute. But let us concede that it is persecution, still, it is political, not religious persecution. It is not owing to any religious opinion of Papists, but a single political dogma which they must hold, or their own church pronounces them diabolical. We do not oppose the elevation of Papists to office because they hold that a wafer, or piece of bread, is "the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ;" nor because they pray to the Virgin Mary, or invoke saints, or bow down before graven images; but because they believe, if they be true to their church, that they owe a higher allegiance to the Pope, a foreign temporal prince, than to their own government; that this foreign prince may absolve them from all allegiance to their country, and depose their government. This we have proved from Brownson. And we have several times presented this view of our position, but the Antis have been unable, unwilling to perceive the distinction. Perhaps they will give it more heed when they hear it from Brownson, the great exponent of the Papistry in this country, endorsed by twenty five American Bishops of the Papal church. While we differ from Mr. Brownson in much that we are about to quote, yet we fully agree with him that it is the peculiar political tenet, above all others, which excites the jealousy of Protestant governments and people.

In the review of Willkott, or the Days of James the First, from which we have already quoted largely, Mr. Brownson says:

"Why is it that Protestants, wherever they have had the power, have invariably persecuted Catholics? After conceding that bigotry, fanaticism, and error, may have had their influence to add, 'but we are inclined to think the principal cause lies in the very fact that Catholicity is the independence and supremacy of the spiritual order, and teaches that the secular should in all things be subordinated and made subservient to it.' Protestants have, indeed, sometimes persecuted Protestants, not only in the heat of passion, from the love of power, or to save themselves in the eyes of Catholics, from the reproach of being divided into sects, and unable to maintain even the appearance of unity. But persecution of Protestants by Protestants has long since virtually ceased. Sects the most widely separated from each other in doctrine and rites are very good friends, and meet together in a World's Convention, not in perfect harmony, indeed, but without cutting each other's throats." &c. &c.

"Now whence," continues Brownson, "whence comes this inveterate hostility of Protestants of all sects and classes, sorts and sizes, to Catholicity? Why is it that Protestants are more hostile to one Protestant sect than to another? It is certainly not from purely religious motives, for Protestantism does not care, and never did care, enough about religion, properly so called, to persecute any body for its sake. It is not because Protestants feel that their souls are in danger, for they have always conceded that salvation is attainable in our Church; and all they contend for, as any one may see by reading their great English defender, Chillingworth, is, that Protestantism is a safe way of salvation; that is, that a Protestant can be saved as well as a Catholic. . . . It is not zeal for the honor of God, or profound love of truth, for we see them fraternize with infidels and men who scoff at all they call truth. . . . What then is the cause?"

"The cause is undoubtedly secular. This, in fact, is always the cause alleged. Protestantism always denies that she persecutes for religious causes. In England she executed the clergy as traitors, and prohibited the ancient religion because dangerous to the state. Lord John Russell, in his recent legislation against Catholicity, professes to respect religious liberty, and to legislate only to protect the prerogative of the Queen. In this country, what is the great argument against us? It is, that we owe allegiance to a foreign potentate, and cannot be loyal to the republican institutions of the country. In England, Catholicity is said to be opposed to the prerogative of the crown; here, to the prerogative of the people. Always and everywhere Catholics burned, massacred, hung, drawn, and quartered, their estates confiscated, or the profession and practice of their religion subjected to vexatious restrictions in the name and under the influence of the secular power. This is the uniform pretence of the Protestants themselves,

and we may well take them here at their word, and believe that in this they are honest.

"There must, then, certainly be something in the Catholic religion, essentially Catholicity, that is repugnant to the Protestant view of the rights of the secular order; for if it were not so, Protestants would finally have softened towards us, and become as willing to tolerate us as they are to tolerate down-right infidels. Protestantism may vary its forms, but it cannot change its essential nature and live. It professes to be an uprising of the human race in behalf of liberty. This profession, in any respectable sense of the word liberty, is ridiculous, for it is notorious that Protestantism everywhere fosters despotism, now of the throne and now of the mob. Yet there must be a sense in which, what it professes is true. Catholicity does not suppose that Protestants use our terms in our sense. Protestantism was an uprising in favor of what Protestants mean by liberty; but they mean by liberty, not freedom from all restraints not imposed immediately or mediately by God himself, but freedom from all religious authority; from all religion except that which a man conceals for himself. In politics, as against us, they mean by liberty the absolute independence and supremacy of the secular order, and the subordination and subjection of the spiritual. Protestantism, therefore, was an uprising in favor of liberty, indeed, but of the liberty of the flesh, the world, and the devil—the three powers which Catholicity labors incessantly to restrain and reduce to subjection.

"The hostility to Catholicity is not that which, as some pretend, is incompatible with this form of civil government, but that which holds civil government in every country, whatever its form, as much bound to obey the law of God as the meanest of its subjects. It is not merely that it teaches this, for nearly every Protestant sect teaches the same, so far as words go; but it is that Catholicity is a church, a corporation, a kingdom, extending through all nations, with its centre of unity and its supreme chief. If the Church had no visible centre of unity, if it had no supreme ruler on earth, if it were broken into national churches, each confined to a particular nation, and complete within itself, it might teach all the doctrine and observe all the rites it now does, without exciting the jealousy of Protestant governments, or the subject of Protestant persecution. Hostility is excited against it, because, having such visible centre and supreme ruler on earth, it has the power, when the people of any particular nation sincerely and firmly believe it, to render its teaching effectual, and to force the government to regard it, and desist from its attacks on the spiritual order, or its acts against the law of God. It is the Papacy that is dreaded, and we are persecuted, not because we are supposed to believe error, but because we are Papists. Catholicity without the Papacy, if such a thing were conceivable, would be no object of persecution, any would be even acceptable to almost every secular government, as an auxiliary to the civil power. The war is against Peter, on whom Christ founded his church, because Peter is the keeper and administrator of the supreme law of nations as of individuals. As long as Peter sits in his chair at Rome, no State is free to practice injustice, to violate the rights of its neighbors, to oppress its subjects, or to trample on the law of God with impunity. Peter must, then, be dethroned, and war to the death be declared against him, and all who own him as the viceregent of God on earth. Here is wherefore Protestant governments and people wage such deadly war against us, and wherefore they never tolerate us, or leave us to enjoy our rights, where the Pope is predominant, and where, or are likely to be strong enough to exert any important influence on public affairs.

"Here is the main secret of that unrelenting hostility with which Protestants pursue Catholicity. And what is our remedy? How are we to disarm this hostility? By denying the supremacy of the spiritual order, and asserting the absolute independence and supremacy of the State, that is, sacrificing to Caesar? In the first place, to do so would be to give up our faith as Catholics, and to become to all intents and purposes Protestants; and in the second place, were we to do so, and still profess to be Catholics, it would conciliate us no favor, for no Protestant would believe in the sincerity of our disavowal of the hated supremacy. Shall we solemnly protest that we are loyal subjects, and are bound in conscience to obey the civil authority in all things not repugnant to the law of God? To what end? Protestants care nothing for our protestations; for they have a theory that a Catholic will stick to his lie where his religion is concerned. Moreover, what we solemnly protest, in so protesting, is precisely what they object to us, and in protesting it we only aggravate our offence. Protestants entertain no doubt of our loyalty as subjects, that we will always uphold the constituted authorities in all things not repugnant to the Divine law; but this is precisely what they do not want us to do, and what they oppose us for. What they want is the power, when they think the state to do, what they please with it, and when they have got, to make a revolution in order to get it—two things which our doctrine of loyalty to the powers that be, and of the supremacy of the law of God, directly forbids them. It is not because Catholicity does not favor wise, just, and stable civil government, that Protestants oppose it, for that they know it does; but because it condemns both civil despotism and revolutionism. Protestantism in power is still despotism, the despotism either of the monarch or of the mob; and Protestantism out of power is revolutionism. When we limit our allegiance to the state, to these things not repugnant to the law of God, and add, with the Apostles, 'We must obey God rather than man,' we deny the civil despotism, and would establish, and make the principle of civil and religious liberty; and we assert our duty to obey the powers that be, in so far as they are in accordance with the law of God, and in consequence to dissent from, and disobey, all laws and royal subjects, never rendering authority as they command us to do what the law of God forbids, we deny the right of revolution, we condemn the 'sacred right of insurrection,' which Protestantism asserts when out of power. Catholicity interposes and protects the subject when the prince attempts to tyrannize, and also interposes and protects the prince when his subjects are disposed to rebel; precisely what Protestants were agreed, for it must always have been so, to do nothing for.

"It is clear, then, let us do our best, we cannot command the Protestants to change, or convince them that, if we are good Catholics, we are not the enemies of the secular order of the secular order which they always have been. The truth which we must as Catholics hold, and the virtues which we must insist on, are, necessarily, at war with what they as Protestants do, and must seek as the supreme good, and if we are strong in a country, the Church through us will prevent civil tyranny on the one hand, and rebellion on the other, keeping the prince and subject, both the state and the man, within the sphere of their civil rights, and the Church will be able to do it. What Protest-

antism uniformly seeks is intrinsically false and unjust, and therefore in proportion as we are faithful to our religion we must be odious to Protestants, and in a greater or less degree be persecuted by them. Protestantism cannot afford to leave us in peace. It is for this world, and makes men live for this world alone; it is, as we have shown in the foregoing article, essentially heathenism, and as such asserts necessarily the supremacy of the secular order. Catholicity, on the other hand, asserts the supremacy of the spiritual order, and makes religion the only real business of a man's life. How, then, can we commend ourselves to Protestants, or remove their objections to us, without abandoning our religion? How, then, can they ever regard our prosperity otherwise than as dangerous to them?

"This always leads us to attempt to prove to Protestants that we are their very good brothers, and, in their senses good as they are." &c. [Brownson's Quar. Rev., Jan. '52, pp. 53-61.]

The Pope's Supremacy.

"Catholicity must not suppose that Protestants use our terms in our sense."

[Brownson's Quarterly Rev.]

The Mississippi publishes the following which purports to be an extract from "the address of the Roman Catholic Bishops at the Conference" held in Baltimore in May, 1855.

"Beloved Brethren of the Laity we embrace you all with paternal affection, and entreat you to walk circumspectly, for the days are evil. . . . You know what manner of precepts we have given you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; for this is the will of God, your sanctification: Be peaceful, sober, just and faithful in the performance of all duties towards all mankind; practicing patience, forbearance, charity towards all. . . . In the exercise of your rights as free citizens, remember your responsibility to God, and act as freemen, but not as having liberty as a right for malice, but as the servants of God. Respect and obey constituted authorities, for all power is from God, and they that resist resist the ordinances of God and purchase to themselves damnation.

To the General and State Governments you owe allegiance in all that regards the civil order; the authorities of the church challenge your obedience in the things of salvation. We have no need of pressing this distinction, which you fully understand and constantly observe. You know that we have uniformly taught you, both publicly and privately, to perform all the duties of good citizens; and we have never exacted of you as ourselves have never made, even to the highest ecclesiastical authority, any concession inconsistent with the duties we owe to the country and its laws. On every opportune occasion we have avowed these principles, and even in our communications to the late Pontiff we rejected as a calumny the imputation that we were in civil matters subject to his authority. Be not disturbed by any misstatements of our tenets which are daily made, or at the effort to deprive us of our civil rights, and of the confidence and esteem of our fellow citizens.

Formidable as is the combination for this purpose, we do not despair that the justice and goodness of the nation will soon discover the groundless character of the suspicion thrown upon the fidelity of Catholics, whose religion teaches them to respect and maintain the established order of society, under whatever form of government it may be placed. Brethren, let the light of your example shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven. Pray for the conversion and salvation of all men, for this is the will of God, who desires that all men may be saved and may come to the knowledge of the truth."

This Jesuitical document is sufficiently explained, and its hidden meaning unmasked by the long quotation from Brownson in our last issue, and by others which we will insert from time to time. The address is signed by eight Bishops, while Brownson is endorsed by twenty-five, including nearly all of those who signed the address.

Of course the Bishops say "respect and obey constituted authorities," so long as there is no power of resistance, and so long as the "secular order" does not conflict with the "spiritual order;" but when they do conflict, then "obedience ceases to be a virtue," and "the duty of obedience ceases." Then what "Holy Mother Church" demands, becomes one of "the things of salvation;" and of course "the authorities of the church challenge obedience." Whenever the interest of the Pope is at stake, his good subjects will not be slow to believe what is commanded;—the potent argument, "let him be anathema," will convince them that it is a "thing of salvation."

But the Bishops have never exacted of the laity, nor themselves made, "even to the highest ecclesiastical authority, any engagement inconsistent with the duties they owe to the country and its laws." But here they use their words in their sense, not by any means in a Protestant sense, but in a kind of "Pickwickian sense," best understood by themselves, and clearly explained by their organ, Brownson. They limit their "obedience to the state to those things not repugnant to the laws of God," as they understand the law of God. And what do they understand to be the law of God? Whatever the Pope declares to be God's law; because they "hold him to be the Vicar of Christ on earth, and under the special protection of the Holy Ghost, and because" they "have, and can have no better evidence of what is right and just than his decision." So Brownson declares. Then when what Protestants would call "this duties they owe to the country and its laws," conflict with the law of God as expounded by the Pope, all loyal Papists would say they did not owe such duties to the country and its laws. There can be no duty to the country conflicting with duty to "the spiritual order," for the spiritual order is the only one to which they are bound.

Some of the authorities" conflict with the spiritual order, in a Papistic sense, and can be no more than a political and spiritual duty. Thus Brownson tells us, "a civil authority must either yield to the spiritual order, or use its power to further the same purpose, or it must come into conflict with the spiritual order, and thus be unable to do its duty. What Protest-

antism uniformly seeks is intrinsically false and unjust, and therefore in proportion as we are faithful to our religion we must be odious to Protestants, and in a greater or less degree be persecuted by them. Protestantism cannot afford to leave us in peace. It is for this world, and makes men live for this world alone; it is, as we have shown in the foregoing article, essentially heathenism, and as such asserts necessarily the supremacy of the secular order. Catholicity, on the other hand, asserts the supremacy of the spiritual order, and makes religion the only real business of a man's life. How, then, can we commend ourselves to Protestants, or remove their objections to us, without abandoning our religion? How, then, can they ever regard our prosperity otherwise than as dangerous to them?

"This always leads us to attempt to prove to Protestants that we are their very good brothers, and, in their senses good as they are." &c. [Brownson's Quar. Rev., Jan. '52, pp. 53-61.]

"Catholicity must not suppose that Protestants use our terms in our sense."

[Brownson's Quarterly Rev.]

The Mississippi publishes the following which purports to be an extract from "the address of the Roman Catholic Bishops at the Conference" held in Baltimore in May, 1855.

"Beloved Brethren of the Laity we embrace you all with paternal affection, and entreat you to walk circumspectly, for the days are evil. . . . You know what manner of precepts we have given you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; for this is the will of God, your sanctification: Be peaceful, sober, just and faithful in the performance of all duties towards all mankind; practicing patience, forbearance, charity towards all. . . . In the exercise of your rights as free citizens, remember your responsibility to God, and act as freemen, but not as having liberty as a right for malice, but as the servants of God. Respect and obey constituted authorities, for all power is from God, and they that resist resist the ordinances of God and purchase to themselves damnation.

To the General and State Governments you owe allegiance in all that regards the civil order; the authorities of the church challenge your obedience in the things of salvation. We have no need of pressing this distinction, which you fully understand and constantly observe. You know that we have uniformly taught you, both publicly and privately, to perform all the duties of good citizens; and we have never exacted of you as ourselves have never made, even to the highest ecclesiastical authority, any concession inconsistent with the duties we owe to the country and its laws. On every opportune occasion we have avowed these principles, and even in our communications to the late Pontiff we rejected as a calumny the imputation that we were in civil matters subject to his authority. Be not disturbed by any misstatements of our tenets which are daily made, or at the effort to deprive us of our civil rights, and of the confidence and esteem of our fellow citizens.

Formidable as is the combination for this purpose, we do not despair that the justice and goodness of the nation will soon discover the groundless character of the suspicion thrown upon the fidelity of Catholics, whose religion teaches them to respect and maintain the established order of society, under whatever form of government it may be placed. Brethren, let the light of your example shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven. Pray for the conversion and salvation of all men, for this is the will of God, who desires that all men may be saved and may come to the knowledge of the truth."

This Jesuitical document is sufficiently explained, and its hidden meaning unmasked by the long quotation from Brownson in our last issue, and by others which we will insert from time to time. The address is signed by eight Bishops, while Brownson is endorsed by twenty-five, including nearly all of those who signed the address.

Of course the Bishops say "respect and obey constituted authorities," so long as there is no power of resistance, and so long as the "secular order" does not conflict with the "spiritual order;" but when they do conflict, then "obedience ceases to be a virtue," and "the duty of obedience ceases." Then what "Holy Mother Church" demands, becomes one of "the things of salvation;" and of course "the authorities of the church challenge obedience." Whenever the interest of the Pope is at stake, his good subjects will not be slow to believe what is commanded;—the potent argument, "let him be anathema," will convince them that it is a "thing of salvation."

But the Bishops have never exacted of the laity, nor themselves made, "even to the highest ecclesiastical authority, any engagement inconsistent with the duties they owe to the country and its laws." But here they use their words in their sense, not by any means in a Protestant sense, but in a kind of "Pickwickian sense," best understood by themselves, and clearly explained by their organ, Brownson. They limit their "obedience to the state to those things not repugnant to the laws of God," as they understand the law of God. And what do they understand to be the law of God? Whatever the Pope declares to be God's law; because they "hold him to be the Vicar of Christ on earth, and under the special protection of the Holy Ghost, and because" they "have, and can have no better evidence of what is right and just than his decision." So Brownson declares. Then when what Protestants would call "this duties they owe to the country and its laws," conflict with the law of God as expounded by the Pope, all loyal Papists would say they did not owe such duties to the country and its laws. There can be no duty to the country conflicting with duty to "the spiritual order," for the spiritual order is the only one to which they are bound.

Some of the authorities" conflict with the spiritual order, in a Papistic sense, and can be no more than a political and spiritual duty. Thus Brownson tells us, "a civil authority must either yield to the spiritual order, or use its power to further the same purpose, or it must come into conflict with the spiritual order, and thus be unable to do its duty. What Protest-

antism uniformly seeks is intrinsically false and unjust, and therefore in proportion as we are faithful to our religion we must be odious to Protestants, and in a greater or less degree be persecuted by them. Protestantism cannot afford to leave us in peace. It is for this world, and makes men live for this world alone; it is, as we have shown in the foregoing article, essentially heathenism, and as such asserts necessarily the supremacy of the secular order. Catholicity, on the other hand, asserts the supremacy of the spiritual order, and makes religion the only real business of a man's life. How, then, can we commend ourselves to Protestants, or remove their objections to us, without abandoning our religion? How, then, can they ever regard our prosperity otherwise than as dangerous to them?

"This always leads us to attempt to prove to Protestants that we are their very good brothers, and, in their senses good as they are." &c. [Brownson's Quar. Rev., Jan. '52, pp. 53-61.]

"Catholicity must not suppose that Protestants use our terms in our sense."

[Brownson's Quarterly Rev.]

The Mississippi publishes the following which purports to be an extract from "the address of the Roman Catholic Bishops at the Conference" held in Baltimore in May, 1855.

"Beloved Brethren of the Laity we embrace you all with paternal affection, and entreat you to walk circumspectly, for the days are evil. . . . You know what manner of precepts we have given you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; for this is the will of God, your sanctification: Be peaceful, sober, just and faithful in the performance of all duties towards all mankind; practicing patience, forbearance, charity towards all. . . . In the exercise of your rights as free citizens, remember your responsibility to God, and act as freemen, but not as having liberty as a right for malice, but as the servants of God. Respect and obey constituted authorities, for all power is from God, and they that resist resist the ordinances of God and purchase to themselves damnation.

Jefferson's Opinion.

The following is an extract from a letter from Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, dated Paris, November 14, 1789. The letter is found in Jefferson's works, vol 2 pp 371-75. We take the italics from the book.

"With respect to the consular appointments, it is a duty on me to add some observations, which my situation here has enabled me to make. I think it was in the spring of 1784, that Congress (harassed by multiplied applications from foreigners of whom nothing was known but their own information, or on that of others as unknown as themselves) came to a resolution that the interest of America would not permit the naming any person not a citizen to the office of consul, vice-consul, agent of commissionary. This was intended as a general answer to that swarm of foreign pretenders. It appears to me that it will be best, still to preserve a part of this regulation. Native citizens on several valuable accounts, are preferable to aliens, and to citizens alien-born. They possess our language, know our laws, customs, and commerce; have generally acquired in the United States; give better satisfaction; and are more to be relied on, in point of fidelity. Their disadvantages, are, an imperfect acquaintance with the language of this country, and an ignorance of the organization of its judicial and executive powers, and consequent awkwardness, whenever application to either of these is necessary, as it frequently happens. But it happens, that in some of the principal ports of France, there is not a single American citizen, and in others, such as Lyons, Havre, in others such as Nantes and Rouen, and in Bordeaux only, are there two or three. Fortunately for the present moment, most of these are worthy of appointments. But we should look forward to future times, when there may happen to be no native citizens, in a port, but such as, being bankrupt here, taken asylum in France from their creditors, or young ephemeral adventurers in commerce, without substance or conduct, or other descriptions which might disgrace the consular office, without protecting our commerce. To avoid ourselves of our good native citizens, when we have one in a port, and when there are none, to have yet some person to attend to our affairs, it appears to me advisable to declare, by a standing law, that no person but a native citizen shall be capable of the office of consul, and that the consul's presence in the port should suspend, for the time, the functions of the vice-consul. This is the rule of 1784, restrained to the office of consul, and extended to native citizens. The establishing this, by a standing law will guard against the effects of particular applications, and will shut the door against such applications, which will otherwise be numerous. This done, the office of Vice Consul may be given to the best subject of the port, whether citizen or alien, and that of consul be kept open for any native citizen of superior qualifications, who might come afterwards to establish himself in the port. The functions of the vice-consul would become dormant during the presence of his principal, and thus spare us the pain of his departure, and thus spare us the painful operation of revoking and re-appointing him perpetually. Add to this, that during the presence of the consul, the vice-consul would be a mere useless agent, and would be a valuable counselor to his principal, not in the office, but in the language, laws and customs of the country. Every consul and vice-consul should be restricted in his jurisdiction to the Port for which he is named; and the territory nearer to that than any other consular or vice consular port, and no idea be permitted to arise that the grade of consul gives right to any authority whatever over a vice consul or draws on any dependence.

The administration presses makes a great noise over the "pretermitted" clause in the American platform. Has there ever been a platform of any national party which did not pretermitt an "expression of opinion upon the power of Congress to establish or prohibit slavery in any Territory?"

Has any Whig or Democratic platform denied that power, or admitted it? If not, they pretermitt an expression of opinion on the subject. Our platform goes so far at least as to say "that Congress ought not to legislate upon the subject of slavery within the Territories." Such then is the doctrine of the great national American party. On the other hand, the "Union," the national organ of the administration, declares that a national party must "ignore the slavery question altogether." This indicates the line of policy which will probably be pursued by those who arrogate to themselves the name of the Democratic party.

"A Very Good Answer." Some days ago, the Advertiser expressed a desire to know why the Americans at Philadelphia, had formally declared their belief in the existence of a Supreme Being. We proceed to answer the Advertiser, and first we give the PLATFORM OF THE GERMAN ANTI-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION, located in Richmond, Virginia:

"WE DEMAND: 1. Universal suffrage. 2. The election of all officers by the people. The abolition of the Presidency. 3. The Abolition of the Senate. 4. The right of the people to recall their Representatives (easier than) at their pleasure. 5. The right of the people to change the Constitution when they like. 6. All law suits to be conducted without expense. A department of the Government to be set up for the protection of signatures. 7. A reward for acquiring citizenship. 8. Abolition of all penalties for every people struggling for liberty."

"Abolition of laws for the observance of the Sabbath; abolition of prayers in Congress. The supporting of the STATE EMANCIPATION exertions of Cass & M. Clay by Congressional laws. Abolition of the Christian system of punishment, and the introduction of the human amelioration system."

"Abolition of capital punishment."

"Now, it is because there are such sentiments as these, abroad in the land, (under the patronage of Pierce and Rochester) that the American party chooses to start, from the foundation stone of society, and government, and to announce it as their belief, 'that there is a God!'"

"Co-municated. A gentleman of high rank in the upper country, returning home from a country village, had gotten hold of the Philadelphia National Platform. On reading it to his old lady, she cried out, 'Lordy, old man, give that to me to keep, for it's the best thing I ever heard since the Revolutionary war. Let us put it in the Family Bible.' Accordingly he handed it to her, and she pasted it in her Bible, to remain as their motto through life and future generations."

"Our Sentiments.—Hungary for the Hungarians, Turkey for the Turks, Italy for the Italians, France for the French, England for the English, Erin for the Irish, Holland for the Dutch, and America for the Americans."

"We only want one line here."

Foreign Influence.

The Duke of Richmond, lately Governor General of Canada, uses the following language concerning the Government of the United States.

"It will be destroyed, it ought not and will not be permitted to exist. The curse of the French revolution, and subsequent wars and commotions in Europe are to be attributed to its example; and as long as it exists no prince will be safe upon his throne; and the Sovereigns of Europe are aware of this, and they have determined upon its destruction, and they have come to an understanding upon this subject and have decided on the means to accomplish it, and they will eventually succeed, by subversion rather than conquest. All the low and surplus population of the different nations of Europe will be carried into that country. It is and will be a receptacle for the bad and dissipated population of Europe, when they are not wanted for soldiers or to supply the navies, and the governments of Europe will favor such a course. This will create a surplus and a majority of low population, who are so very easily excited, and they will bring with them their principles and in nine cases out of ten adhere to their ancient and former government, laws, manners, customs and religion, and will transmit them to their posterity, and in many cases propagate them among the natives. These men will become citizens, and by the constitution and laws will be invested with the right of suffrage. Hence, discord, dissension, anarchy and civil war will ensue, and some popular individual will assume the government and restore order, and the Sovereigns of Europe, the emigrants, and many of the natives, will sustain him. The church of Rome has a design upon that country, and it will in time be the established religion, and I will aid in the destruction of that republic. I have conversed with many of the Sovereigns and princes of Europe, and they have all expressed the same opinions relative to the government of the United States and their determination to subvert it."

At a meeting held at the Methodist Episcopal Church in Yazoo City, on Monday the 16th day of July, 1855, for the purpose of organizing a society auxiliary to the South-western Bible Society of New Orleans, Rev. J. A. Light was called to the chair, and R. B. Mayes appointed Secretary.

Mr. Thomas R. Markham, agent for the South-western Bible Society, submitted a draught of a constitution, which, on motion of N. G. Nye, Esq. was adopted as follows:

CONSTITUTION.

I. This Society shall be called the "Yazoo County Bible Society;" and it shall be auxiliary to the South-western Bible Society of New Orleans.

II. The object of this Society shall be to promote the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, in whole or in part, in English, those of the commonly received version.

III. All persons desiring to join in its funds shall be members for one year; those contributing one dollar or more shall be entitled to receive a Bible or Testaments to the value of twenty-five cents (if called for within twelve months); those contributing fifteen dollars at one time or twenty dollars at two payments, shall be members for life.

IV. All funds not wanted for circulating the Scriptures within the Society's own limits, shall be paid over annually to the Parent Society, to promote the objects of that Society.

V. The officers of the Society shall consist of a President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer, whose duties shall be such as their titles import; and who, together with five additional members shall constitute a Board of Directors—of whom five shall constitute a quorum.

VI. The Board of Directors shall make its own By-Laws, and manage the affairs of the Society. It shall be subdivided into three committees, each consisting of two members, together with the President of the Society, viz: on (1st) "Public Meetings and Collections" (2d) "Supply of Bibles" (3d) "Gratuities or other Distributions."

VII. It shall be the duty of the Board of Directors to meet frequently on adjournment, or on call of the President; to keep a good supply of books; to appoint local distributors; to see what collections, in any way, are made annually within the entire bounds of the Society; and that all funds are forwarded early to the Parent Society with a statement of the amounts designed for the objects of that Society, and for the purchase of Bibles.

VIII. There shall be a General Meeting of the Society on the fourth Monday of October, in each year, when a full report of their doings shall be presented by the Board of Directors (a copy of which shall be furnished to the Parent Society); and when a new election of Officers and Directors shall take place. Should the Society fail of an Annual meeting the same Officers and Directors shall continue until an election does occur.

IX. Any Branch Society, or Bible Committee formed within the bounds of this Auxiliary, by paying over its funds annually, shall receive Bibles and Testaments at cost prices.

X. No alteration shall be made in the Constitution, except at an annual meeting and by consent of two thirds of the members present.

The Society then proceeded to the election of Officers, which resulted as follows:

OFFICERS, 1855.

PRESIDENT, Wm. J. Leake.

VICE PRESIDENT, C. F. Hamer, Esq.

SECRETARY, R. B. Mayes.

TREASURER, Peter B. Cook.

DIRECTORS, Rev. J. R. West;

Henry Hagan,

B. L. Hower,

Wm. Wymann, and

D. M. Hollingsworth.

Mr. Markham then moved the adoption of the following resolution, which was carried.

Resolved, That the Yazoo County Bible Society be earnestly commended to the contributions, the efforts, and the prayers of the patriotic, the philanthropic, and the Christian of the community, which it is located.

On motion of N. G. Nye, Esq.

Resolved, That the Secretary furnish to the members of the place a copy of the proceedings of the meeting, and that the report that they be published.

On motion the Society adjourned.

J. A. LIGHT, Chairman.

R. B. MAYES, Secretary.